

April 6, 2004  
Case No.: FR 000135 (7790/334)  
Serial No.: 10/015,843  
Filed: December 10, 2001  
Page 6 of 10

**REMARKS/DISCUSSION OF ISSUES**

Priority Claim. In the Non-Final Office Action dated November 28, 2003, Examiner Anderson acknowledged the claim for priority and receipt of certified copies of all the priority documents. The Applicant hereby thanks Examiner Anderson for acknowledging the claim for priority and receipt of certified copies of all the priority documents.

Specification. In response to the Non-Final Office Action dated November 28, 2003, the Applicant has amended the specification herein to correct typographical and format errors. No new matter was introduced by the amendment of the specification herein.

Claims. In the Non-Final Office Action dated November 28, 2003, Examiner Anderson objected to and rejected pending claims 1-6, and 10 on various grounds. The Applicant responds to each objection and rejection as subsequently recited herein, and respectfully requests reconsideration and further examination of the present application under 37 CFR § 1.112:

A. Examiner Anderson objected to claim 10 under 37 C.F.R. §1.75(c)

The Applicant has cancelled claim 10 herein without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter of claim 10. Withdrawal of the objection of claim 10 under 37 C.F.R. §1.75(c) is therefore respectfully requested

B. Examiner Anderson rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶1

The Applicant has cancelled claim 1 herein without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶1 is therefore respectfully requested.

April 6, 2004  
Case No.: FR 000135 (7790/334)  
Serial No.: 10/015,843  
Filed: December 10, 2001  
Page 7 of 10

C. Examiner Anderson rejected claims 1-6 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2

The Applicant has cancelled claims 1-6 and 10 without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter of claims 1-6 and 10. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-6 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2 is therefore respectfully requested.

D. Examiner Anderson rejected claims 1-6 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,269,075 to *Crist et al.*

The Applicant has thoroughly considered Examiner Anderson's remarks concerning the patentability of claims 1-6 and 10 over *Crist*. The Applicant has also thoroughly read *Crist*. To warrant this 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of claims 1-6 and 10, *Crist* must show each and every limitation of independent claim 1 in as complete detail as is contained in independent claim 1. See, MPEP §2131. The Applicant respectfully traverses this anticipation rejection of claims 1-6 and 10, because *Crist* fails to disclose and teaches away from "the cover (28) comprises at least one hook (40) which extends into the inside of the body (24)" as recited in independent claim 1.

As to the traversal, as illustrated in FIG. 1, *Crist* discloses a frame 4 attached to a bossing 3 of a face 2 of a main body 1. Frame 4 employs grooves 11 for receiving hooks 14 of a blocking cover 12. Frame 4 further employs a slot 9 for receiving a locking element 17 whereby hooks 14 can be retained in a disassembled position that does not extend inside of main body 1 as best illustrated in FIG. 5, and in an assembly position that does not extend inside of main body 1 as best illustrated in FIG. 6. Specifically, *Crist* clearly teaches the use of bossing 3 and locking element 17 to hold hooks 14 in either position. Thus, the use of bossing 3 by *Crist* teaches away from hooks 14 extending into main body 1 when being held in either position.

April 6, 2004

Case No.: FR 000135 (7790/334)

Serial No.: 10/015,843

Filed: December 10, 2001

Page 8 of 10

While the Applicant respectfully traverses this 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of claims 1-6 and 10 as shown above, the Applicant has cancelled claims 1-6 and 10 herein without prejudice and disclaimer to the subject matter of claims 1-6 and 10 herein, and added new claims 11-16. The Applicant respectfully asserts that *Crist* and the remaining art of record, alone or in combination, fails to disclose, teach or suggest the following limitation combinations of new independent claims 11 and 14:

1. "wherein, in the assembled position, said cover includes at least one hook extending through said opening into said main body" as recited in independent claim 11; and
2. "wherein, in the assembled position, said main body includes at least one hook extending through said opening into said cover" as recited in independent claim 14.

No new matter was introduced by the addition of new claims 11-16.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-6 and 10 under §102(b) as being anticipated by *Crist* and an allowance of new claims 11-16 are therefore respectfully requested.

April 6, 2004

Case No.: FR 000135 (7790/334)

Serial No.: 10/015,843

Filed: December 10, 2001

Page 9 of 10

**SUMMARY**

Examiner Anderson's objections and rejections of claims 1-6 and 10 have been obviated by the cancellation herein of claims 1-6 and 10. The Applicant has supported an allowance of new claims 11-16 over the art of record. The Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 11-16 as added herein fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103 and 112. In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration and early passage to issue of the present application is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, Examiner Anderson is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Dated: April 6, 2004Respectfully submitted,  
ARNAUD FLEGEO


PHILIPS IP & STANDARDS  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001  
(914) 333-9606

---

Jack D. Slobod  
Registration No. 26,236  
Attorney for Applicant

CARDINAL LAW GROUP  
Suite 2000  
1603 Orrington Avenue  
Evanston, Illinois 60201  
Phone: (847) 905-7111  
Fax: (847) 905-7113

---

  
Leslie B. Wilson  
Registration No. 33,816  
Attorney for Applicant